REMARKS

This reply is in response to the Office Action dated April 18, 2011. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 28, 30-47, 50-51, 53-65, 143-146, 149-150, 152-155, 157-176, 179-180, 182-183, 185-198, and 223 will be pending in the present application. Claims 1-10, 13-14, 16-20, 23-27, 29, 156, and 184 are cancelled herein, and claims 28, 143, 173, and 223 are amended. Support for the claim amendments is found in the specification (as published) at, *inter alia*, paragraphs [0023], [0025], and the Examples. No new matter has been added. All claims have been rejected.

Entry of the foregoing amendments and reconsideration of the claims in light of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-10, 13, 14, 16-20, 23-51, 53-65, 143-146, 149-176, 182-198, and 223 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by Dharmarajan (WO 02/051928; hereafter "*Dharmarajan")* in view of Stevens *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,943,215; hereafter "*Stevens*"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. The cited references, alone and in combination, do not teach, disclose, or suggest with a reasonable expectation all elements of the pending claims, and therefore do not render the claims obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103.

The pending claims are directed to articles having a first layer and a second layer. The first layer comprises a low crystallinity, single site metallocene catalyzed polymer having the recited composition and characteristics, while the second layer comprises a high crystallinity polymer comprising polypropylene. Further, the second layer is plastically deformed, and the resulting article has a Haze value greater than 70%, as required in every claim.

At a minimum, Dharmarajan and Stevens fail to teach, disclose, or suggest articles as claimed having a plastically deformed second layer and a Haze value greater than 70%. The Office recognizes that the references do not teach the claimed haze, but attempts to remedy those deficiencies by citing Stevens, stating that "Stevens teaches that haze can be controlled by selecting the amount of each component, the molecular weight of the components, and the amount of ethylene in the copolymer." (Office Action at page 5, citations omitted.) While

Stevens discusses the optical properties of the polymer blends described therein, it does not teach, disclose, or suggest articles comprising two layers such as those presently claimed, nor does it provide a reasonable expectation that such multilayer articles would have Haze values greater than 70%. Rather, Stevens teaches the desirability of low Haze values, stating that the polymer blends described therein are "particularly preferred for applications where excellent clarity is desired." Stevens reports Haze values for certain exemplary polymer blends having a crystalline polypropylene matrix phase and an impact modifying lower crystallinity dispersed phase in Tables 12 and 13 therein. All of those reported Haze values are less than 40%, and the discussion surrounding the results describes the examples having lower Haze values as having "better haze." (See, e.g., Stevens at column 67, line 22.)

In contrast, the high Haze values claimed for the articles of the present invention are achieved not by tailoring the components of the polymers used therein, but by physically deforming the second, high crystallinity layer of the articles, resulting in increased surface roughness and therefore higher Haze values. (See, e.g. paragraphs [0007], [0023], and [0025]-[0030] of the pending application.) Because physical deformation of the second layer imparts surface roughness, which gives the articles a commercially desirable surface appearance and feel, and the degree of surface roughness is reflected in the Haze value, higher Haze values are desired. Neither Dharmarajan nor Stevens teach, disclose, or suggest articles as claimed having a physically deformed high crystallinity second layer and Haze values greater than 70%, nor do they provide any motivation to form such articles.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the cited references do not render the pending claims obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections and allowance of the pending claims.

CONCLUSION

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for a sufficient Extension of Time. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1712 (Docket #: 2003B002/2).

Respectfully submitted,

July 18, 2011
Date

/Hsin Lin/
Hsin Lin
Attorney for Applicants
U.S. Registration No. 53,221

ExxonMobil Chemical Company
Law Technology
P.O. Box 2149
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149
(281) 834-1978 Office
(281) 834-2495 Facsimile